

GEROS Evaluation Quality Assurance Tool

Version: September 2021

MIDTERM EVALUATION OF UNICEF'S PROGRAMME "BUILDING ROHINGYA REFUGEE AND HOST COMMUNITY RESILIENCE IN COX'S BAZAR"

REPORT RATING SUMMARY

Overall Rating	73%	Satisfactory
● ● ● ● ● Exceptional (96% - 100%)	5	
● ● ● ● Highly Satisfactory (87.5% - 95.99%)	4	
● ● ● Satisfactory (62.5% - 87.49%)	3	Meets UNICEF/UNEG standards for evaluation reports and decision makers may use the evaluation with confidence
● ● Fair (35% - 62.49%)	2	
● Unsatisfactory (0% - 34.99%)	1	

REPORT DETAILS

Title of the evaluation report	MIDTERM EVALUATION OF UNICEF'S PROGRAMME "BUILDING ROHINGYA REFUGEE AND HOST COMMUNITY RESILIENCE IN COX'S BAZAR"
Report sequence number	Bangladesh/64/2022/17515
Region	ESAR
Year of report	2022
Office	Bangladesh
Coverage (countries)	Bangladesh
ToRs present	Yes
Date of review (dd/mm/yyyy)	January 12, 2022
Name of review firm	IOD PARC

CLASSIFICATION OF EVALUATION REPORT

Management of evaluation (<i>Managerial control and oversight of evaluation</i>)	Jointly managed with one or more UN agencies
Unicef goal areas (<i>Alignment with strategic plan priorities</i>)	
Every child survives and thrives	Yes
Every child learns	Yes
Every child is protected from violence and exploitation	Yes
Every child lives in a safe and clean environment	Yes
Every child has an equitable chance in life	Yes
Gender equality (cross-cutting)	Yes
Humanitarian action (cross-cutting)	Yes
Evaluation object	Programme
Evaluation type	Summative
Evaluation strategy	Mixed methods
Evaluation design (<i>primary method used</i>)	Output & Outcome
Evaluation level	Programme
Geographic scope	National
Primary SDG(s) covered (<i>number</i>)	No reference to SDG

EQA Summary: The rather will provide top line issues for this evaluation relevant for feedback to senior management (positive and negative), summarizing how the evaluation report meets or fails to meet all criteria. As relevant, the rather will highlight best practice/added value elements and the level of complexity of the evaluation.

A comprehensive and methodologically robust report. The findings are coherent and clear although often not clearly supported by evidence.

The executive summary is of very good quality. Likewise, the purpose, scope, and methodology of the evaluation are coherent and in the case of the methodology very robust even though the indicators are not described.

Although the findings section could be improved, the conclusions and recommendations are of very good quality, i.e. clear, supported by the findings, and in the case of the recommendations, actionable.

Weaknesses include:

- Issues relating to child rights and Leave no-one Behind are mentioned in the methodology but not adequately analysed in the findings
- The lessons learned that are present are solid, but given the richness of the findings more learning could have been harvested
- A comprehensive of the M&E system has not been made
- In general, the presentation of evidence is poor and the findings are not obviously supported by evidence. It is often not cited nor clear where it has come from.
- Measures taken to mitigate limitations are not well described
- The evaluation matrix is poorly constructed
- The structure of the report is coherent but excessively long. The gender and HR approach is well integrated in all sections except in the recommendations where it could have been made more explicit.

Recommendations for Improvement: The rater will identify topline recommendations to improve the evaluation, and be specific to the sections of the report where shortcomings were found. As relevant, resources will be cited to assist evaluation managers in overseeing future evaluations.

The report is generally good and there are a few recommendations for improvement.

- it is important that the findings are supported by specific evidence in all cases. This means not only explaining what has been found and what consequences it has had but also how the findings were reached, e.g., "most of the women who were pregnant thought that... this is backed by publication X and by government officials". The report does not do this sufficiently in the findings section.
- Mitigation measures should have been outlined
- further attention should have been paid to the evaluation matrix
- M&E systems should have been investigated further
- Finally the evaluation team could have harvested more lessons learned from the rich findings presented
- the report is unwieldy in length. A 90 page report which may affect accessibility.

SECTION RATINGS

SECTION A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (weight 5%)	100%
Question 1. Can the executive summary inform decision-making?	

	i	Is clearly presented, serves as a standalone document useful for informing decision making, and is of relevant conciseness and depth for key users (Maximum of 5 pages unless otherwise specified in ToR).	Yes	The presentation of the executive summary is very clear and professional and is within an appropriate length.
	ii	Includes all necessary elements (overview of the intervention, evaluation purpose, objectives and intended audience, evaluation methodology, key conclusions on findings, lessons learned if requested, key recommendations) as per the ToR.	Yes	Yes, it is complete.
	iii	Includes all significant information needed to understand the intervention and the evaluation AND does not introduce new information from what is presented in the rest of the report.	Yes	The intervention and evaluation is perfectly understandable in the summary and there is nothing that is not included in the body of the report.
SECTION B: BACKGROUND (weight 5%)			86%	
Question 2. Is the object of the evaluation clearly described?				
	i	Clear and relevant description of the intervention, including: location(s), timelines, cost/budget, and implementation status.	Yes	All these aspects are well explained in a straightforward and concise manner.
	ii	Clear and relevant description of intended rightsholders (beneficiaries) and duty bearers (state and non-state actors with responsibilities regarding the intervention) by type (i.e., institutions/organizations; communities; individuals...), by geographic location(s) (i.e., urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods, town/cities, sub-regions...) and in terms of numbers reached, with disaggregation by gender, age, disability . . . (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation).	Partially	The emphasis of the description is clearly placed on rightsholders but other stakeholders are also mentioned where relevant in the description of the four programme components. What is missing is a more detailed typology of government stakeholders.
Question 3. Is the context of the intervention clearly described?				
	i	Clear and relevant description of the context of the intervention (i.e. relevant policy, socio-economic, political, cultural, power/privilege, institutional, international factors) and how context relates to the implementation of the intervention.	Yes	The context is described in a clear and very detailed way. In fact, it would have been useful to summarise it considerably.
	ii	Linkages drawn to the SDGs and relevant targets and indicators for the area being evaluated.	Yes	There are no references to the SDGs apart from a footnote. This is, however implicit.
	iii	Clear and relevant description (where appropriate) of the status and needs of the rightsholders/beneficiaries of the intervention.	Yes	Absolutely, the needs of refugees and host communities are very detailed and segregated according to different relevant variables, such as gender.
Question 4. Are key stakeholders, their relationships and contributions clearly identified?				
	i	Identification of implementing agency(ies), development partners, right holders, and additional duty bearers and other stakeholders; and of linkages between them (e.g., stakeholder map) (if relevant).	Yes	A concise but comprehensive stakeholder analysis is provided and complemented by detailed stakeholder information in Annex 1 and Annex 9.
	ii	Identification of the specific contributions and roles of key stakeholders (financial or otherwise), including UNICEF.	Partially	This is done more implicitly than explicitly. UNICEF's financial contribution through the EU is clearly detailed. Other UNICEF contributions can be inferred from the description of programme strategies. For example, it can be assumed that UNICEF provide the know-how of its staff and the value of its brand. However, there is no section in the report where this is specifically addressed.
SECTION C: EVALUATION PURPOSE, OBJECTIVES AND SCOPE (weight 5%)			92%	
Question 5. Is the purpose of the evaluation clearly described?				
	i	Purpose of evaluation is clearly defined, including why it was needed at that point in time, its intended use, and key intended users.	Partially	The explanation of the purpose of the evaluation is quite disorganised but all the information is there. There is a specific section explaining the uses and potential users of the evaluation.
Question 6. Are the objectives and scope of the evaluation clear and realistic?				
	i	Clear and complete description of what the evaluation seeks to achieve by the end of the process with reference to any changes made to the objectives included in the ToR (if applicable).	Yes	There is a detailed description of the objectives of the evaluation which do not differ from those of the ToR.
	ii	Clear and relevant description of the scope of the evaluation: what will and will not be covered (thematically, chronologically, geographically with key terms defined), as well as, if applicable, the reasons for this scope (e.g., specifications by the ToRs, lack of access to particular geographic areas for political or safety reasons at the time of the evaluation, lack of data/evidence on particular elements of the intervention).	Yes	All important aspects of the scope of the evaluation are specified.
Question 7. Is the theory of change, results chain or logic well articulated?				
	i	Clear description of the intervention's intended results, or of the parts of the results chain that are applicable to, or are being tested by, the evaluation.	Yes	A brief description of the results framework is given in the body of the report and detailed in annex 3
	ii	Causal relationship between outputs and outcomes is presented in narrative and/or graphic form (e.g., results chain, logic model, theory of change, evaluation matrix).	Yes	The causal relationships between activities and changes are described in both the Logic Model and the ToC.
	iii	For theory-based evaluations, the theory of change or results framework is assessed, and if requested in the ToR, it is reformulated/improved by the evaluators.	Yes	The evaluation team produced a retrospective ToC which is annexed to the report.
SECTION D: EVALUATION DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY (weight 20%)			77%	

Question 8.	Does the evaluation use questions and the relevant evaluation criteria that are explicitly justified as appropriate for the purpose of the evaluation? <i>UNICEF evaluation standards refer to the OECD/DAC criteria - Relevance; Coherence; Effectiveness; Efficiency; Sustainability; Impact (not all are necessarily relevant for all evaluations). Evaluations should also consider equity and leaving no-one behind, gender and human rights based approach (these can be mainstreamed into other criteria). Humanitarian evaluations should also consider Coverage; Connectedness; Coordination; Protection; Security.</i>		
	i Evaluation questions and sub-questions are appropriate for meeting the objectives and purpose of the evaluation. The relevant criteria are specified and are aligned with the questions.	Yes	The evaluation questions have been modified and improved from those proposed in the ToR, making them sharper and more focused. These questions and sub-questions are perfectly suited to the needs of the evaluation.
	ii In addition to the questions and sub-questions, the evaluation matrix includes indicators, benchmarks, assumptions and/or other processes from which the analysis can be based and conclusions drawn.	No	The matrix does not include these elements.
Question 9.	Does the report specify adequate methods for data collection, analysis, and sampling?		
	i Evaluation design and set of methods are relevant and adequately robust for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope; and are fully and clearly described.	Yes	The methodology of the evaluation is perfectly explained and complemented with an illustrative graph that adds a great value.
	ii Data sources are appropriate - these would normally include qualitative and quantitative sources (unless otherwise specified in the ToR) - and are all clearly described.	Yes	The sources of information are adequate, well described and follow the indications given in the ToR.
	iii Sampling strategy is provided - it should include a description of how diverse perspectives are captured (or, if not, provide reasons for this).	Yes	A cluster sampling strategy was followed and is described adequately.
	iv Clear and complete description of the methods of analysis.	Yes	There is a clear and concise description of the methods of information analysis.
	v Methodology allows for drawing causal connections between outputs and expected outcomes.	Yes	The methodology allows for causal traceability.
	vi Clear and complete description of limitations and constraints faced by the evaluation, including gaps in the evidence that was generated and mitigation of bias, and how these were addressed by the evaluators (as feasible).	Partially	The limitations of the evaluation are well described but the measures taken to mitigate them are not.
Question 10.	Are ethical issues and considerations described? The evaluation should be guided by the UNEG ethical standards for evaluation. As such, the evaluation report should include:		
	i Explicit and contextualized reference to the UNEG obligations of evaluators (independence, impartiality, credibility, conflicts of interest, accountability) and/or the principles in the 2020 revised UNEG Ethical Guidelines (integrity, accountability, respect, beneficence).	Yes	Explicit mention is made that the evaluators have followed the ethical principles laid down by UNEG.
	ii Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues relevant to methodology and how they are applied (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm). For those cases where the evaluation involves interviewing children, explicit reference is made to the UNICEF procedures for Ethical Research Involving Children.	Yes	Ethical safeguards for different vulnerable groups are well explained.
Question 11.	Does the evaluation incorporate innovative practice that adds value to the evaluation process?		
	i Innovation practice is used to improve the quality of evaluation process. This could evident in several ways such as the design of the methodology (i.e. use of technology for data gathering, extensive participatory processes, systematic analysis processes such as collaborative outcomes reporting and incorporation of big data, specific strategies to address complexity such as outcome harvesting, strong child rights focus), or ways of sharing of evaluation results.	No	Although the methodology is robust and thorough, it cannot be said to be particularly innovative. A traditional assessment framework (OECD/DAC) has been chosen. The data collection tools do not include innovative elements such as transformative participatory tools or the use of new technology-based technologies and the analysis is mostly done by the evaluation team without other innovative validation spaces such as sensemaking or asynchronous spaces to validate findings. Finally, the report is presented in a traditional pdf without being supported by more visual deliverables such as interactive presentations or videos.
SECTION E:	EVALUATION FINDINGS (weight 25%)	50%	
Question 12.	Do the findings clearly address all evaluation objectives and scope?		
	i Findings marshal sufficient levels of evidence to systematically address all of the evaluation's questions, sub-questions and criteria.	Partially	The findings are organised under each of the evaluation sub-questions. A summary of the findings is presented under each of the sub-questions, totalling 67 findings, which is too many to be able to highlight what is really important. The findings have a lot of descriptive and explanatory information, i.e. what happened and why. However, there is less explanation of how the findings were reached, i.e. the evidence.
	ii Explicit use of the intervention's results framework/ToC in the formulation of the findings.	Yes	The findings have been organised around the evaluation questions which in turn have taken into account both the reconstruction of the ToC and the programme's original log frame.
Question 13.	Are evaluation findings derived from the conscientious, explicit and judicious use of the best available, objective, reliable and valid data and by accurate quantitative and qualitative analysis of evidence.		

	i Evaluation uses credible forms of qualitative and quantitative data. It presents both output and outcome-level data as relevant to the evaluation framework. Triangulation is evident through the use of multiple data sources.	No	Although there are some exceptions, in general, the presentation of evidence is poor. It is not often cited, and when it is, it is not stated where it comes from. For example, it may be said that they have come from reports but the reports are not referenced, or a percentage may be mentioned without stating where the data comes from: <i>"the evaluation team found that 25.9 per cent of the adolescents approached CPC when they came across a case of child rights violation"</i> . Rarely are different sources of information mentioned to support a finding, although there are exception: <i>"Based on the monitoring reports and discussions with the representatives of UNICEF as well as the implementing partners, it was found that"</i>
	ii Findings are clearly supported by, and respond to, the evidence presented, including both positive and negative. Findings are based on clear performance indicators, standards, benchmarks, or other means of comparison as relevant for each question.	No	As mentioned above, findings are not supported by evidence and the evidence presented is poor in general.
	iii Causal factors (contextual, organizational, managerial, etc.) leading to achievement or non-achievement of results are clearly identified. For theory-based evaluations, findings also analyse the logical chain (progression -or not- from implementation to results).	Yes	The context in which the findings have occurred and why they occur is adequately explained.
Question 14.	Does the evaluation assess and use the intervention's Results Based Management elements?		
	i Assessment of the adequacy of the intervention's monitoring system (including completeness and appropriateness of results/performance framework - including vertical and horizontal logic, M&E tools and their usage) to support decision-making.	Partially	A comprehensive assessment of the M&E system has not been made, although it should be clarified that this was not a requirement of the ToR. What the report does do is refer to M&E systems where relevant. Additionally there is a finding on M&E and a recommendation that also mentions it.
SECTION F:	EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS & LESSONS LEARNED (weight 10%)	88%	
Question 15.	Do the conclusions clearly present an objective overall assessment of the intervention?		
	i Conclusions are clearly formulated and reflect the purpose and objectives of the evaluation. They are sufficiently forward looking (if a formative evaluation or if the implementation is expected to continue or have additional phase).	Yes	The conclusions are adequately formulated under each of the criteria being evaluated and clearly connected to the objectives of the evaluation. Being a summative evaluation, the conclusions are indeed forward looking to such an extent that some of the text reads like recommendations: <i>"some additional efforts are required to ensure achieving the long-term objectives of the programme"</i> .
	ii Conclusions are derived appropriately from findings, and present a picture of the strengths and limitations of the intervention that adds insight and analysis beyond the findings.	Yes	The conclusions are clearly linked to the findings and brief but adequate analyses are made of the strengths and weaknesses of the programme.
Question 16.	Are logical and informative lessons learned identified? [N/A if lessons are not presented and not requested in ToR]		
	i Identified lessons stem logically from the findings, have wider applicability and relevance beyond the object of the evaluation.	Partially	Indeed, the lessons learned are related to the findings and are applicable beyond the programme. However, there are 67 findings and four lessons. One would assume that there is considerably more learning that could have been distilled from such a comprehensive analysis of the programme.
	ii Lessons are clearly and concisely presented, yet have sufficient detail to be useful for intended audience.	Yes	Yes, they are clear, concise and adequate.
SECTION G:	RECOMMENDATIONS (weight 15%)	88%	
Question 17.	Are recommendations well grounded in the evaluation?		
	i Recommendations align with the evaluation purpose, are clearly formulated and logically derived from the findings and/or conclusions.	Yes	Each of the recommendations has been linked to one or more of the evaluation questions which in turn articulate the findings.
	ii Recommendations are useful and actionable for primary intended users and uses (relevant to the intervention); guidance is given for implementation as appropriate.	Yes	Each of the recommendations specifies to which audience they are addressed and gives indications as to how they could be implemented.
	iii Process for developing the recommendations is described, and includes the Involvement of duty-bearers, as well as rights holders when feasible (or explanation given for why they were not involved).	Yes	At the beginning of the section it gives an account of how the recommendations have been developed and which stakeholders have been involved in their development.
Question 18.	Are recommendations clearly presented?		
	i Clear identification of groups or duty-bearers responsible for action for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations). Clear prioritization and/or classification of recommendations to support use.	Partially	The content of the recommendations is very well presented. However, the format is unorthodox and difficult to read in pdf format.
SECTION H:	REPORT STRUCTURE AND PRESENTATION (weight 5%)	71%	
Question 19.	Does the evaluation report include all relevant information?		
	i Opening pages include: Name of evaluated object, timeframe of the evaluation, date of report, location of evaluated object, names and/or organization(s) of the evaluator(s), name of organization commissioning the evaluation, table of contents -including, as relevant, tables, graphs, figures, annexes; list of acronyms/abbreviations, page numbers.	Yes	The report format includes all the necessary elements

	ii Annexes include: terms of reference, evaluation matrix, list of interviewees, results chain/ToC/logical framework (unless included in report body), list of site visits, data collection instruments (such as survey or interview questionnaires), list of documentary evidence. Other appropriate annexes could include: additional details on methodology, information about the evaluator(s), etc.	Yes	All necessary annexes are included
Question 20.	Is the report logically structured?		
	i Structure is easy to identify and navigate (for instance, with numbered sections, clear titles and sub-titles, well formatted).	Yes	The report is well organised and easy to navigate.
	ii Structure accords to UNICEF guidelines for evaluation reports: context, purpose and methodology would normally precede findings, which would normally be followed by conclusions, lessons learned and recommendations.	Yes	The document follows a logical sequence.
Question 21.	Is the report well presented?		
	i Report is of reasonable length; it does not exceed number of pages that may be specified in ToR.	No	The report is 90 pages long, excluding annexes and executive summary. This length is not suitable for a detailed reading of the document.
	ii Report is easy to understand (written in accessible way for intended audience) and generally free from grammar, spelling and punctuation errors.	Partially	The document is well written but there is an overuse of acronyms.
	iii Frequent use of visual aids (such as infographics, maps, tables, figures, photos) to convey key information. These are clearly presented, labeled, and referenced in text.	Partially	Some tables and boxes have been inserted to break up the text and make the document visually less monotonous, but no figures or graphics have been used.
SECTION I:	EVALUATION PRINCIPLES (weight 10%)	62%	
Question 22.	Did the evaluation design and style consider incorporation of the UN and UNICEF's commitment to a human rights-based approach to programming, to gender equality, and to equity?		
	i Reference and use of rights-based framework, and/or CRC, CCC, CEDAW and/or other rights related benchmarks in the design of the evaluation.	Partially	They are referenced only in the recommendations
	ii Clear description of the level of participation of key rights holders and duty bearers in the conduct of the evaluation (for example, a reference group is established, stakeholders are involved as informants or in data gathering).	Partially	Although it is mentioned that a reference group will be formed in the ToR, the report does not mention how it contributed to the evaluation. The involvement of other stakeholders is mentioned, for example in the elaboration of recommendations.
	iii Language is empowering and inclusive, avoiding gender, heterosexual, age, cultural and religious bias, among others; use terminology of rights holders and duty bearers; data is disaggregated by marginalized group; differential results are assessed (distribution of results across different groups).	Yes	The language is very considerate
	iv Evaluation assesses the extent to which the implementation of the intervention addresses child rights and Leave No-one Behind (gender and other excluded and marginalized groups). It is disability inclusive.	No	These aspects are mentioned in the evaluation questions and in the methodology but are not analysed in the findings.
Question 23.	Does the evaluation meet UN SWAP evaluation performance indicators? (Note: this question will be rated according to UN SWAP standards with detail provided below)	7	
	i GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.	Satisfactorily integrated	Although GEEW and HR is not mentioned in the scope section, it is present in the objectives of the evaluation. The evaluation matrix cross-cuts gender and HR approaches appropriately. The approach is present in both the evaluation questions and indicators.
	ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.	Fully integrated	The methodology of the evaluation reflects in an unmistakable way how the evaluation has integrated a gender and HR approach. The definition of the sampling strategies does specify the gender and HR considerations that have been applied. The sources of information have been conveniently disaggregated to capture the differentiated views of different relevant groups including women and adolescent girls.
	iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.	Satisfactorily integrated	The gender analysis is presented both in the findings and in the conclusions where, in addition to being cross-cutting in all criteria, a specific criterion has also been added. However, the recommendations should have reflected this analysis more extensively.

SWAP Rating Guidance

- i GEEW is integrated in the Evaluation Scope of analysis, and evaluation criteria and questions are designed in a way that ensures GEEW-related data will be collected.**
- Does the evaluation assess whether sufficient information was collected during the implementation period on specific result indicators to measure progress on human rights and gender equality results?
 - Does the evaluation include an objective specific to assessment of human rights and gender equality considerations or was it mainstreamed in other objectives?
 - Was a standalone criterion on gender and/or human rights included in the evaluation framework or mainstreamed into other evaluation criteria?
 - Is there a dedicated evaluation question or sub-question regarding how GEEW was integrated into the subject of the evaluation?

ii A gender-responsive methodology, methods and tools, and data analysis techniques are selected.

- a. Does the evaluation specify how gender issues are addressed in the methodology, including: how data collection and analysis methods integrate gender considerations and ensure data collected is disaggregated by sex?
- b. Does the evaluation methodology employ a mixed-methods approach, appropriate to evaluating GEWE considerations?
- c. Are a diverse range of data sources and processes employed (i.e. triangulation, validation) to guarantee inclusion, accuracy and credibility?
- d. Does the evaluation methods and sampling frame address the diversity of stakeholders affected by the intervention, particularly the most vulnerable, where appropriate?
- e. Were ethical standards considered throughout the evaluation and were all stakeholder groups treated with integrity and respect for confidentiality?

iii The evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations reflect a gender analysis.

- a. Does the evaluation have a background section that includes an intersectional analysis of the specific social groups affected by the issue or spell out the relevant normative instruments or policies related to human rights and gender equality?
- b. Do the findings include data analysis that explicitly and transparently triangulates the voices of different social role groups, and/or disaggregates quantitative data, where applicable?
- c. Are unanticipated effects of the intervention on human rights and gender equality described?
- d. Does the evaluation report provide specific recommendations addressing GEWE issues, and priorities for action to improve GEWE or the intervention or future initiatives in this area?